arXiv:1604.07517v2 [quant-ph] 5 Apr 2017

Classical stochastic ensemble computation and quantum computation: A comparison study with readout inequality

Jeongho Bang[a,b,*], Junghee Ryu[c,d], Chang-Woo Lee[e], Ki Hyuk Yee[a,f], Jinhyoung Lee[a,*], Wonmin Son[g,h,*]

[a] *Department of Physics, Hanyang University, Seoul 133-791, Korea*
[b] *Smart Quantum Communication Research Center & School of Electrical Engineering, Korea University, Seoul, Korea*
[c] *Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, 117543 Singapore, Singapore*
[d] *Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland*
[e] *School of Computational Sciences, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-722, Korea*
[f] *School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Seoul, Seoul 02504, South Korea*
[g] *Department of Physics, Sogang University, Seoul 121-742, Korea*
[h] *University of Oxford, Department of Physics, Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PU, UK*

Abstract

"Where do classical and quantum computers fit in?" or "what can and cannot they do?" have been long-standing questions. In particular, drawing a clear borderline between classical and quantum computations is obscure and still remains controversial. With this issue in mind, we attempt to find a qualitatively distinguishable feature of quantum computation (QC). The main approach for our study is to consider a powerful classical computing machine called "stochastic ensemble machine (SEnM)," which runs with an *ensemble* consisting of finite (even infinite, in principle) copies of a single probabilistic machine, e.g., a probabilistic Turing machine (PTM). Then, we assume and test the following hypothesis: there exists an SEnM imitating QC. The test is carried out by introducing an information-theoretic inequality—we call "readout inequality." This

*Corresponding author
Email addresses: jbang@korea.ac.kr (Jeongho Bang), hyoung@hanyang.ac.kr (Jinhyoung Lee), sonwm71@sogang.ac.kr (Wonmin Son)

inequality is obeyed by the SEnM's QC imitation and also imposes a critical condition on QC: if the hypothesis holds, the inequality should be satisfied by QC with the SEnM imitating it. However, QC can violate the inequality, and the above hypothesis is generally not accepted. Noting that quantum Turing machine can cover an SEnM and thinking of SEnM $\supseteq$ PTM, it is clear that QC is characterized beyond any classical probabilistic computation.

Keywords: quantum computation, stochastic ensemble computation, quantum Turing machine, readout inequality

1. Introduction

By relating computation to physics, Feynman asked, "can (quantum) physics be simulated by (classical) computers?" and gave the negative answer [1]: It *might be* impossible to efficiently simulate a quantum process on a probabilistic Turing machine (PTM) [1]. Then, a quantum computer that could simulate any quantum system was conjectured by Feynman. Following Feynman's original arguments, Deutsch developed a physically realizable model of a quantum computer, i.e., a quantum Turing machine (QTM), a quantum analogue of the PTM [3]. After that, a formal argument that a QTM can be more powerful than a PTM was provided [4, 5], and quantum computation (QC) has been investigated intently and more deeply with the advent of celebrated quantum algorithms [6, 7, 8]. Today, it is widely believed that QC solves hard problems much faster. However, skepticism toward QC still exists since the identification of a clear border between classical and quantum computations is still obscure [9, 10, 11]. This would arise without ruling out the potential of any classical probabilistic computation model that is believed to imitate the QC [12, 13, 14].

In this study, we find a qualitatively distinguishable feature of QC in substantially different angle from the conventional approaches (e.g., identifying the

[1] Similarly, around this time, Benioff also argued that quantum computation may be at least as powerful as classical computation by showing how quantum physics can simulate the computational process of a classical reversible Turing machine [2].

computational complexity [15]), which supports our belief that QC is a superset of classical computation. For this purpose, we first consider a powerful classical computing machine called a "stochastic ensemble machine (SEnM)," which runs with an *ensemble* consisting of a large (even infinite, in principle) number of single probabilistic machines, e.g., PTMs. Such an SEnM is thus a superset of PTM (even the parallelization of PTMs) and even covers non-Markov chain computation—the unlimited bit-information can be communicated to the next computation steps [2]. Then, we immediately ask: can an SEnM imitate QC? Our approach for seeking the answer is to test a hypothesis, i.e., the existence of an SEnM statistically imitating QC. This test is carried out on the basis of an information-theoretic inequality called "readout inequality." This inequality imposes the critical condition: if the hypothesis holds, the inequality should be satisfied by QC with the SEnM imitating it. However, a violation of this inequality can be observed in a certain scheme of QC, whereas it can never occur by the SEnM's QC imitation. Such a discrepancy tells us that the above hypothesis does not hold and this implies that the SEnM can, generally, not find the desired solution as fast as the QC. Thus, noting that the QTM can imitate the SEnM computation and SEnM $\supseteq$ PTM, we conclude that QC is characterized beyond any classical probabilistic computation in our context.

The above-described approach borrows from those that have been considered in the hypothetical physics model, often called local-realism or macro-realism [16, 17]. Thus our result might appear trivial at first glance. In fact, the (temporal) nonlocal features, which originates from the discrepancy of the physical assumptions [3], has commonly been believed to provide a critical difference between "classical" and "quantum" in terms of physical theory. However, this is not true in the context of computation and/or communication complexity;

[2] Note that the SEnM harnesses all sort of the classical computing techniques (classical parallelism, heuristics, and so on).

[3] "Elements of physical reality" and "locality" in the local-realism test, or "macroscopic reality" and "non-invasiveness of the measurements" in the macro-realism test.

namely, a violation of Bell or Leggett-Garg inequality itself cannot be a crucial signature of the "quantum" any more in the computation. If a (powerful) computer allows the communication of a large bit-information in its computation, we can observe such a violation even though there are no quantum elements (see Refs. [18] and [19]). In this sense, the SEnM can also exhibit the violation of those inequalities. For example, if we test the macro-realism with any Leggett-Garg inequalities for the states of the ensemble, it will give the inequality violation because the SEnM can cover non-Markov chain computation (as will be described later). Furthermore, we impose no limitation on the communication between the ensemble copies for the parallelization (e.g., speed, amount of information, etc). Thus, if we do any local-realism test with the locally separated copies, they can, in principle, show the violation of Bell inequalities, and even the degree of violation can be higher than those allowed by quantum theory because there is no restriction on the locality condition [20]. Therefore, closer inspection of the computing element, r/w head, and finding the readout inequality that enables our hypothesis test would also be worthy of remark in the current work.

2. Quantum computation versus stochastic ensemble computation

We start with a brief description of QC. Conventionally, QC runs as follows. First, an input $|\psi_0\rangle$ is initialized, and then, we place it into a kernel operation (e.g., a quantum Fourier transformation or several iterations of a nontrivial transformation), which consists of the sequences of fundamental unitary (gates) operations (hereafter, denoted by $\hat{C}_{\rm comp}$). Finally, the solution information is extracted from the output state [4]. We decompose $\hat{C}_{\rm comp}$ into the number of computation steps, say L, such that $\hat{C}_{\rm comp} = \hat{U}_L \cdots \hat{U}_2 \hat{U}_1$, where $\hat{U}_j$ ($j = 1, 2, \ldots, L$) are the unitary transformations, realized as the possible transition maps in the QTM [23]. Thus, the action of $\hat{C}_{\rm comp}$ is described as $|\psi_0\rangle \rightarrow$

[4] There is, of course, another scheme for QC, so-called measurement-based QC [21, 22]. However, such a scheme is not of our current interest, at least in this work



Figure 1: (color online) A schematic of the SEnM computation. For simplicity, we consider only three copies. Each copy (e.g., a PTM) is made to have its own potential computation routes that reach their branches toward a local output area [as depicted in (a), (b), and (c)], and the overall computation routes are constructed by all of these copies. The SEnM follows a particular computation route, and we *can watch* the route being chosen. On the other hand, in a QC, it is possible to explore all computation routes simultaneously, and we *cannot watch* the computation because the readouts are not performed at the middle of the computation. Here, we also illustrate the computation of a "nondeterministic Turing machine," which can even cast and/or reject the computation routes concurrently [15]. Of course, such an extraordinary ability is far from being realized.

$\hat{U}_1 |\psi_1\rangle \to \hat{U}_2 \cdots \to \hat{U}_L |\psi_L\rangle$, where $|\psi_j\rangle = \sum_{m_j} \omega_{m_j} |m_j\rangle$, and $m_j \in \mathcal{M}$ denotes the readout symbol ($\mathcal{M}$ is a set of possible symbols). Then, the quantum probability $P_Q(m_j|\psi_j)$ of measuring m_j at j is defined as [3]

$$P_Q(m_j|\psi_j) = \left|\omega_{m_j}\right|^2 = \left|\langle m_j|\psi_j\rangle\right|^2 . \tag{1}$$

We note that the probabilities $P_Q(m_j|\psi_j)$ are abstract mathematical quantities and are not characterized in the middle of the QC in general. However, they are to be evaluated for our specific purpose, as described later.

We then describe a powerful classical computing machine—an SEnM—that runs in parallel with an ensemble of indistinguishable single-machine (e.g., PTM) copies. Each copy consists of two components—a finite processor and an infinite memory (or 'tape')—of which only a finite portion is ever used, as in a conventional Turing machine [5]. Each copy is assumed to be definitely in one of the following possible states: for the k-th copy, its state $s_k \in \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is

[5] An additional element—a "cursor"—is necessary to address the currently scanned memory

a finite set of possible states. The state collection of all copies is denoted by $\mathbf{s}_j = (s_1, s_2, \cdots)_j$ at any step j of the computation. Here, let $m(s_k) \in \mathcal{M}$ be the readout (or measurement) symbol of s_k at the current memory location. Then, the probability $P(m_j|\mathbf{s}_j)$ of reading the symbol m_j at step j can be defined as

$$P(m_j|\mathbf{s}_j) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \delta_{m(s_k),m_j}, \tag{2}$$

where $\delta_{m,m'}$ is the Kronecker delta, and $\sum_{m_j} P(m_j|\mathbf{s}_j) = 1$. Note that these probabilities $P(m_j|\mathbf{s}_j)$ are also not characterized in the computation, and the readout is performed at the end of the computation, as in the QC.

Each copy of the SEnM is allowed to organize its *own* computation routes, which may potentially reach the desired solution. Thus, the SEnM executes a *stochastic computation* in which the probability of reaching the targets is given by the sum of the probabilities along the possible routes of *every* copy (see Fig. 1) [6]. More specifically, a single step of the computation (i.e., a transition $\mathbf{s}_{j-1} \to \mathbf{s}_j$) is stochastic and is specified by the conditional probabilities. A set of such conditional probabilities corresponds to a table of the computation instructions in a Turing machine [24]. More explicitly, a conditional probability $C(\mathbf{s}_1|\mathbf{s}_0)$ defines the first computational step in which the ensemble is in $\mathbf{s}_1$ from a given initial $\mathbf{s}_0$. In general, the j-th step is defined by the conditional probability $C(\mathbf{s}_j|\mathbf{s}_{j-1}, ..., \mathbf{s}_0)$, conditioned to the state collections $\mathbf{s}_{j'}$ $(j' < j)$, which were obtained in the earlier steps (except the initial $\mathbf{s}_0$). Thus, we have a joint probability up to the j-th step, given in terms of the conditional probabilities C by

$$P(\mathbf{s}_0, ..., \mathbf{s}_j) = C(\mathbf{s}_j|\mathbf{s}_{j-1}, ..., \mathbf{s}_0) \cdots C(\mathbf{s}_1|\mathbf{s}_0) P(\mathbf{s}_0), \tag{3}$$

where $P(\mathbf{s}_0)$ is the initial distribution of $\mathbf{s}_0$. Here, note that our SEnM is clearly

location. However, it will be omitted throughout this paper, as our main conclusion remains valid (see Refs. [3, 24] for a more detailed summary of the Turing machine).

[6] In fact, such an ensemble machine is modeled on a hypothetical computing machine, a so-called nondeterministic Turing machine (NTM) [15], even though our machine cannot simultaneously explore the two (or more) computation routes.

beyond a Markov chain computation [25] and covers any classical probabilistic computation; namely, SEnM $\supseteq$ PTM.

3. Hypothesis and readout inequality in the SEnM's QC imitation

Now, we shall test if there exists an SEnM model that can imitate QC. To this end, we define the conditional probability of *reading out* a symbol m_j, given m_{j-1} at every j-th step, as [7]

$$P(m_j|m_{j-1}) = \frac{P(m_{j-1}, m_j)}{P(m_{j-1})}. \tag{4}$$

The pairwise joint probabilities $P(m_{j-1}, m_j)$ are given as the marginals of the *grand joint probability of the readout symbols*:

$$P(m_0, ..., m_j) = \sum_{\{\mathbf{s}_k\}} P(\mathbf{s}_0, ..., \mathbf{s}_j) \prod_{k=0}^{j} P(m_k|\mathbf{s}_k). \tag{5}$$

Then, we specify our hypothesis as follows.

H *There exists an SEnM such that it provides the conditional probabilities* $P(m_j|m_{j-1})$ *equal to* $P_Q(m_j|m_{j-1})$ *at each* j*-th step:*

$$P(m_j|m_{j-1}) = P_Q(m_j|m_{j-1}), \ (\forall j = 1, \ldots, L), \tag{6}$$

and then, $P(m_L|m_0)$ *for obtaining the final computation outcome* m_L *given the initial* m_0 *is equal to the quantum probability* $P_Q(m_L|m_0)$*:*

$$P(m_L|m_0) = P_Q(m_L|m_0). \tag{7}$$

Here, it is easily inferred that the inverse of the hypothesis **H** is true; namely, there exists a QTM that statistically imitates the SEnM computation. For example, one can drive his/her QTMs in a statistical way, such that $\langle m_j| \hat{\rho}_j |m_j\rangle$ is equal to $P(m_j|\mathbf{s}_j)$, where $\hat{\rho}_j$ is a *statistical mixture* of the symbol states decohered from $|\psi_j\rangle$.

[7] Here, we note that these readout probabilities are not characterized in QC and also in the SEnM computation.

To test this hypothesis **H**, we use an information-theoretic inequality called the readout inequality as

$$H(M_L|M_0) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{L} H(M_j|M_{j-1}), \tag{8}$$

which is derived by the validity of the grand joint probability $P(m_0, \ldots, m_L)$ in Eq. (5) (for details of the derivation, see Appendix A). Here,

$$H(M_{l'}|M_l) = -\sum_{m_l, m_{l'}} P(m_l, m_{l'}) \log_2 P(m_{l'}|m_l) \tag{9}$$

are the conditional Shannon entropies ($l' > l \in [0, L]$), where $P(m_l, m_{l'})$ are the marginals given from the grand joint probability $P(m_0, \ldots, m_L)$ in Eq. (5), and the conditional probabilities $P(m_{l'}|m_l)$ are defined as Eq. (4).

The test of **H** using the readout inequality in Eq. (8) is suggestive of those that have been discussed in physical models of local-realism and/or macrorealism [16, 17]. Thus, adopting the view of these hypothetical physical models (if one may particularly wish), an SEnM implicitly assumes "reality," i.e., the identity of the state collections $\mathbf{s}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{s}_L$. This can be interpreted in terms of the existence of the probability distribution $P(\mathbf{s}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{s}_L)$ defined in Eq. (3) for L steps of SEnM computation (see Ref. [26]). It also has "non-invasive measurability" (or temporal locality), which means that reading the symbol m_l at the l-th step does not have any effect on the state collection $\mathbf{s}_l$ itself and on the readouts at the subsequent steps. In such a framework, we can predict that a violation of the readout inequality is generally forbidden for any computation in which the above two assumptions are implied. Of course, it is possible to violate the inequality forcibly by imitating the nonclassical correlations if a certain amount of bit information can be communicated between locally or temporally separated testing points (see Ref. [18] for the local-realistic version and Ref. [19] for the macrorealistic version). Nevertheless, we clarify that the violation of the readout inequality in Eq. (8) can never be observed by an SEnM because there is no communication of the readout symbols (and any related information) in our test. Recall the fact that the readouts (or measurements)

are not carried out in the middle of computation (in both the QC and SEnM computations), and only the information of $\mathbf{s}_j$ can be communicated to the $(j' > j)$-th step. Consequently, the readout inequality imposes the critical condition: if the hypothesis **H** holds, the readout inequality is also obeyed by QC with the SEnM imitating it.

4. Hypothesis test with the readout inequality

From now on, we investigate whether the hypothesis **H** is true in general. As the readout inequality is obeyed by *every* SEnM computation, the most general and direct way is to examine whether or not the inequality in Eq. (8) can be violated by QC. Thus, we first consider a specific QC scheme, the so-called quantum amplitude amplification (QAA), where the iterative runs of a given unitary $\hat{G}_g$ enhance the probability amplitude (not the probability itself) of the target $|\tau\rangle$ among the number of candidates (say, N) [27]. Here, it is useful to know that, for a certain condition, $\hat{G}_g$ is described as a rotation of the angle Θ on the plane of the target $|\tau\rangle$ and its orthogonal state $\left|\tau^{\perp}\right\rangle$ as (for details, see Appendix B)

$$\hat{G}_g = -e^{i\Theta\hat{\sigma}_x}, \tag{10}$$

where $\Theta \leq 2\sqrt{P_Q(m_0 = \tau|\psi_0)}$, and $\hat{\sigma}_x = |\tau\rangle\left\langle\tau^{\perp}\right| + \left|\tau^{\perp}\right\rangle\langle\tau|$. Note that Θ is supposed to be small because the initial probability $P_Q(m_0 = \tau|\psi_0)$ is vanishingly small with a large N. The total number of iterations n_c is given as $n_c = \mathrm{CI}\left[\Theta^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \sqrt{P_Q(m_0 = \tau|\psi_0)}\right)\right]$, where CI$[x]$ is the closest integer to x. Here, if $P_Q(m_0 = \tau|\psi_0) = \frac{1}{N}$, we can obtain a quadratic speedup with $n_c = O(\frac{\pi}{4}\sqrt{N})$ compared to $O(N)$ of the classical strategy [7, 28].

Then, we show that a violation of the inequality can occur in QAA. First, we define $\hat{C}_{\mathrm{comp}}$ by cutting the entire process of QAA; namely, we only consider a finite number of iterations n_d $(< n_c)$ such that $\hat{C}_{\mathrm{comp}} = \hat{U}_L \cdots \hat{U}_2\hat{U}_1 = \hat{G}_g^{n_d}$ by letting $\hat{U}_j = \hat{G}_g^{n_d/L}$ $(\forall j)$. Here, n_d and L are initially chosen so that n_d/L becomes an integer number. To proceed, we define the measurement $\hat{M}_j =$

$\hat{\Pi}_{m_j \neq \tau} - \hat{\Pi}_{m_j = \tau}$, where $\hat{\Pi}_{m_j=\tau} = |\tau\rangle\langle\tau|$, and $\hat{\Pi}_{m_j \neq \tau} = \hat{\mathbb{1}} - |\tau\rangle\langle\tau|$. We then have $P_Q(m_j) = \mathrm{Tr}(\hat{\rho}_j \hat{\Pi}_{m_j})$ and $P_Q(m_j|m_{j-1}) = |\langle m_j| \hat{G}_g^{n_d/L} |m_{j-1}\rangle|^2$, where $\hat{\rho}_j = |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j| = \hat{G}_g^{(n_d/L)j} \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{G}_g^{(n_d/L)j\,\dagger}$. Again, we note that these measurements are performed only for the purpose of our inequality test. Using Eq. (10) and by simple calculations, the inequality in Eq. (8) is rewritten as

$$h(n_d\Theta) \leq Lh\left(\frac{n_d}{L}\Theta\right), \tag{11}$$

where

$$h(x) = -(\cos^2 x)(\log_2 \cos^2 x) - (\sin^2 x)(\log_2 \sin^2 x). \tag{12}$$

Here, let us define the quantity $D = Lh\left(\frac{n_d}{L}\Theta\right) - h(n_d\Theta)$ so that a negative value of D indicates a violation and its degree. In such settings, let $n_d \to \frac{\pi}{4\Theta}$ by taking n_d to be $\frac{1}{2}n_c$. Note that, if n_c is odd, $n_d = \lfloor \frac{1}{2}n_c \rfloor$, where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the floor of x, the largest integer less than or equal to x. Then, $h(n_d\Theta)$ approaches the theoretical maximum, $h(n_d\Theta) \to h(\frac{\pi}{4}) = 1$. In contrast, $Lh\left(\frac{n_d}{L}\Theta\right) \to Lh\left(\frac{\pi}{4L}\right)$, which can still be less than 1. This directly results in a violation, $D = Lh\left(\frac{\pi}{4L}\right) - 1 < 0$, for an appropriately chosen L. The maximum violation is given as $D_{\min} = \mathrm{CI}\left(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta}\right) h(\Theta) - h\left(\mathrm{CI}\left(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta}\right)\Theta\right)$ with $L = n_d = \mathrm{CI}\left(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta}\right)$. We particularly infer that $D_{\min} \to -1$ when $\Theta \to 0$, or equivalently, $N \to \infty$ (for more detailed analyses, see Appendix C).

Therefore, it is clear that, in general, QC does not agree with a legitimate grand joint probability distribution $P(m_0, \ldots, m_L)$ [as in Eq. (5)] constructed from the conditional probabilities $P_Q(m_j|m_{j-1})$. This points toward the invalidity of the hypothesis **H**. In physical terms, this invalidity is closely related to the failure of the implicitly assumed conditions: the state collections $\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{s}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{s}_L$ are objective, and the symbol of the readout m_j is depends only on $\mathbf{s}_j$. These two conditions in our classical model of an SEnM are quite natural but generally incompatible with QC.

5. Summary and discussion

To summarize, we have studied a distinguishable feature of QC by considering a seemingly-powerful classical computing machine called the SEnM. Our main question was "can an SEnM imitate QC?," and the answer was "generally, no." To obtain such an answer, we specified the following hypothesis **H**: there exists an SEnM that statistically imitates QC. The test of this hypothesis was carried out with an information-theoretic inequality called the readout inequality. By establishing the subtly connected link between the physical assumptions implicitly involved in **H**, we explicitly showed that there is a discrepancy between a QC and the SEnM's QC imitation; namely, QC can violate the readout inequality, even though it is imposed that the two computations should satisfy the readout inequality if the hypothesis **H** holds [8]. This discrepancy directly indicates that **H** is not generally accepted. And further, this result implies that it is generally not possible to prepare a classical setting which produces the desired output with the same number of QC steps. Therefore, thinking of SEnM $\supseteq$ PTM, it is clear that QC is characterized beyond any realizable model of a PTM in our context. We believe that these statements are important in both theoretical and practical manner.

Here we clarify, again, that the violation of Bell or Leggett-Garg inequalities cannot become a crucial evidence of the "quantum" any more, particularly in the context of computation and/or communication complexity. In fact, the SEnM can exhibit the violations of Bell and Leggett-Garg inequalities on the parallelization, i.e., communications between ensemble copies, and on the process of the stochastic computation. In this sense, our results are not trivial

[8] Of course, it is also true that the violation of the readout inequality would be associated with the *realistic* features, i.e., each copy has already a property of symbol. However, the hypothesis **H** does not describe any physical theory but any hypothetical computing machine that may have the ability to imitate the quantum computation. Thus, it is desirable to consider the suggestiveness of the results in terms of the hypothesis **H**, rather than the physical theory implicitly involved in **H**.

although our approach follows the test of those inequalities.

Before closing, we would like to comment that one might gain another insight from viewing the SEnM in terms of the parallelization of the individual machine copies. As indicated, each copy can be considered as a single probabilistic computer such as a PTM. Thus, one might relate classical parallelism with QC by corresponding "many copies at a time" to "a superposition of many states at a time." In this sense, our study backs our belief that it is difficult to relate classical parallelism with quantum parallelism.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Hyunseok Jeong, Marcin Pawłowski, Marek Żukowski, and Ryszard Horodecki for helpful discussions and comments. We acknowledge the financial support of the Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning (No. 2014R1A2A1A10050117) and the MSIP (Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning), Korea, under the ITRC (Information Technology Research Center) support program (IITP-2015-R0992-15-1017) supervised by the IITP (Institute for Information & Communications Technology Promotion). WS acknowledges the ICT R&D program of the MSIP/IITP (No. 2014-044-014-002) and the NRF (No. NRF-2013R1A1A2010537) for financial support. JR acknowledges the TEAM project of FNP, EU project BRISQ2, and the National Research Foundation and Ministry of Education in Singapore.

Appendix A. Derivation of the inequality in Eq. (8)

We derive the inequality in Eq. (8) by assuming the validity of the grand joint probability $P(\{m_j\})$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, L$ in Eq. (5). First, consider the joint Shannon entropy

$$H(\{M_j\}) = -\sum_{\mathbf{m}} P(\{m_j\}) \log_2 P(\{m_j\}), \tag{A.1}$$

where $\sum_{\mathbf{m}}$ stands for $\sum_{m_L} \cdots \sum_{m_1} \sum_{m_0}$, and the base of the logarithm function is chosen to be 2. By the chain rule for the Shannon entropy, we may factor the joint entropy $H(\{M_j\})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} H(\{M_j\}) &= H(M_L|M_0,\ldots,M_{L-1}) \\ &\quad + H(M_{L-1}|M_0,\ldots,M_{L-2}) \\ &\quad + \cdots + H(M_1|M_0) + H(M_0), \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where $H(M_{l'}|M_l)$ $(l' > l \in [0, L])$ is the conditional Shannon entropy defined by

$$H(M_{l'}|M_l) = -\sum_{m_l, m_{l'}} P(m_l, m_{l'}) \log_2 P(m_{l'}|m_l). \tag{A.3}$$

Here, the probabilities $P(m_l, m_{l'})$ are the marginals from $P(\{m_j\})$, and $P(m_{l'}|m_l)$ are given from Eq. (4). By employing the information inequalities [29, 30],

$$\begin{aligned} H(M_j|M_0,\ldots,M_{j-1}) &\leq H(M_j|M_{j-1}), \\ H(M_0, M_j) &\leq H(M_0, M_1, \ldots, M_j), \end{aligned} \tag{A.4}$$

we arrive at the information-theoretic inequality

$$H(M_L|M_0) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{L} H(M_j|M_{j-1}). \tag{A.5}$$

Appendix B. Quantum amplitude amplification

In general, the operation $\hat{G}_g$ consists of two reflections as [27, 31]

$$\hat{G}_g = -\hat{I}_{Q(m)} \hat{I}_\phi. \tag{B.1}$$

Here, $\hat{I}_\phi$ is the quantum Householder reflection defined by $\hat{I}_\phi = \hat{\mathbb{1}} - (1 - e^{i\phi}) |\psi_0\rangle \langle\psi_0|$, where $\hat{\mathbb{1}}$ is the identity operation. The phase ϕ is generally given from 0 to π. Another reflection $\hat{I}_{Q(m)}$ is the quantum oracle operation defined by $\hat{I}_{Q(m)} = \sum_m e^{iQ(m)} |m\rangle \langle m|$, where $Q(m)$, called the "query function," is defined such that $Q(\tau) = \varphi_\tau \in (0, \pi]$ and $Q(m) = 0$ for all $m \neq \tau$. Here, we also note that $\hat{I}_{Q(m)} = \hat{\mathbb{1}} - (1 - e^{i\varphi_\tau}) |\tau\rangle \langle\tau|$.

For further analysis, we let

$$\left|\tau^{\perp}\right\rangle = \frac{|\psi_0\rangle - \sqrt{P_Q(m_0=\tau|\psi_0)}\,|\tau\rangle}{\sqrt{1-P_Q(m_0=\tau|\psi_0)}}, \tag{B.2}$$

where it is assumed that $\left|\tau^{\perp}\right\rangle$ absorbs the relative phase. Then, $\hat{G}_g$ is given as a 2×2 unitary matrix on the plane of $|\tau\rangle$ and $\left|\tau^{\perp}\right\rangle$, assuming $O\left(P_Q(m_0=\tau|\psi_0)\right)\rightarrow 0$, as

$$\hat{G}_g = \begin{pmatrix} -e^{i\varphi_\tau} & \left(1-e^{i\phi}\right)\sqrt{P_Q(m_0=\tau|\psi_0)} \\ \left(1-e^{i\phi}\right)e^{i\varphi_\tau}\sqrt{P_Q(m_0=\tau|\psi_0)} & -e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.3}$$

For a large-scale (i.e., $N \gg 1$) problem, such an assumption is reasonable because $P_Q(m_0=\tau|\psi_0)$ would be vanishingly small. We then write $\hat{G}_g$ explicitly, neglecting the global phase factor $e^{-i\frac{\phi+\varphi_\tau}{2}}$, as follows:

$$\hat{G}_g = \hat{R}_{\varphi_\tau/2}\left[\begin{pmatrix} e^{i\frac{\xi}{2}} & \\ & e^{-i\frac{\xi}{2}} \end{pmatrix} + i\Theta\hat{\sigma}_x\right]\hat{R}^{\dagger}_{\varphi_\tau/2}, \tag{B.4}$$

where

$$\hat{R}_{\varphi_\tau/2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -e^{i\frac{\varphi_\tau}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi &= \phi - \varphi_\tau, \\ \Theta &= 2\sqrt{P_Q(m_0=\tau|\psi_0)}\sin\frac{\phi}{2}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

and $\hat{\sigma}_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ in the bases of $\{|\tau\rangle, \left|\tau^{\perp}\right\rangle\}$. We rewrite $\hat{G}_g^{2^m}$ in Eq. (B.4) as

$$\hat{G}_g^{2^m} = \hat{R}_{\varphi_\tau/2}\hat{H}^{2^m}_{\Theta,\xi}\hat{R}^{\dagger}_{\varphi_\tau/2}, \tag{B.7}$$

where $\hat{H}_{\Theta,\xi}$ is defined by

$$\hat{H}_{\Theta,\xi} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\frac{\xi}{2}} & \\ & e^{-i\frac{\xi}{2}} \end{pmatrix} + i\Theta\hat{\sigma}_x. \tag{B.8}$$

The operation $\hat{H}^{2^l}_{\Theta,\xi}$ is evaluated, for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, as

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{H}^{2^1}_{\Theta,\xi} &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{i2\frac{\xi}{2}} & \\ & e^{-i2\frac{\xi}{2}} \end{pmatrix} + i2\cos\left(2^{-1}\xi\right)\Theta\hat{\sigma}_x, \\
\hat{H}^{2^2}_{\Theta,\xi} &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{i2^2\frac{\xi}{2}} & \\ & e^{-i2^2\frac{\xi}{2}} \end{pmatrix} + i2^2\cos\left(2^{-1}\xi\right)\cos\left(2^0\xi\right)\Theta\hat{\sigma}_x, \\
&\vdots \\
\hat{H}^{2^m}_{\Theta,\xi} &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{i2^m\frac{\xi}{2}} & \\ & e^{-i2^m\frac{\xi}{2}} \end{pmatrix} + i2^m\Gamma\Theta\hat{\sigma}_x,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

where

$$\Gamma = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1}\cos\left(2^j\frac{\xi}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{2^m}\frac{\sin\left(2^m\frac{\xi}{2}\right)}{\sin\frac{\xi}{2}}. \tag{B.10}$$

Here, if we assume that the phase factor $e^{-i\frac{\varphi_\tau}{2}}$ is also absorbed into $\left|\tau^\perp\right\rangle$, we can ignore $\hat{R}_{\varphi_\tau/2}$ and $\hat{R}^\dagger_{\varphi_\tau/2}$ in Eq. (B.7); thus, we have $\hat{G}^{2^m}_g = \hat{H}^{2^m}_{\Theta,\xi}$.

Then, by using Eqs. (B.8)–(B.10), we can express $\hat{G}^{2^m}_g$ without a loss in generality as

$$\hat{G}^{2^m}_g = -e^{-i2^m\Gamma\Theta\hat{\sigma}_x} - \begin{pmatrix} 1-e^{-i2^m\frac{\xi}{2}} & \\ & 1-e^{i2^m\frac{\xi}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.11}$$

where the first term $-e^{-i2^m\,\Gamma\Theta\,\hat{\sigma}_x}$ is the main process of amplitude amplification, and the last term represents the inaccuracy or error. Here, we note that the condition $\xi \to 0$, known as the "phase-matching condition," should be satisfied to successfully complete amplitude amplification without error (see Refs. [32, 31] for the issues). Namely, as $\Gamma \to 1$ when $\xi \to 0$ [with the property of the sine function in Eq. (B.10)], it is straightforward that

$$\hat{G}^{2^m}_g = -e^{-i2^m\Theta\hat{\sigma}_x}. \tag{B.12}$$

Appendix C. Detailed analyses of the inequality violations in QAA

To see the violation more explicitly, we first define two parameters, α and β, related to the factors L, n_d, and n_c:

$$\alpha = \log_{n_c} L, \text{ and } \beta = \log_{n_c} n_d, \tag{C.1}$$



Figure C.2: (color online) We depict the inequality violations (i.e., the negative values of D) in the possible region of a two-dimensional plane (β, α). Here, we consider four cases: (a) $\Theta = \sqrt{1/10^3}$, (b) $\sqrt{1/10^4}$, (c) $\sqrt{1/10^5}$, and (d) $\sqrt{1/10^6}$. In each graph, we also draw the lines for α corresponding to $L = 2$ (red dashed), $L = 3$ (blue dashed), $L = 4$ (green dashed), and $L = \mathrm{CI}(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta})$ (magenta dashed).

where $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq 1$, which is imposed by the condition $1 \leq L \leq n_d \leq n_c$. Another parameter for the inequality test is Θ, which is given in terms of n_c, or equivalently, the problem scale N. Note that Θ is assumed to be very small for very large N in a practical application. For example, if we consider the original Grover's search algorithm, we have $\Theta = 2\sqrt{1/N}$ for $\phi = \varphi_\tau = \pi$. In this circumstance, we show the graphs of the inequality violations ($D < 0$) in the possible region of the two-dimensional space of β and α, i.e., $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, and $\alpha \leq \beta \leq 1$ (see Fig. C.2). Here, we consider four cases of $\Theta = \sqrt{1/10^\gamma}$ with (a) $\gamma = 3$, (b) $\gamma = 4$, (c) $\gamma = 5$, and (d) $\gamma = 6$. In each graph, we draw dashed lines for α corresponding to $L = 2$ (red), 3 (blue), 4 (green), and $\mathrm{CI}(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta})$ (magenta). Note that the maximum violation is observed on the line of $\mathrm{CI}(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta})$. It is also seen that the violations are conspicuous when L becomes large.



Figure C.3: (color online) Graphs of D versus β are drawn for $L = 2$ (red points), 3 (blue points), 4 (green points), and CI($\frac{\pi}{4\Theta}$) (magenta points). Each graph corresponds to that in Fig. C.2: (a) $\Theta = \sqrt{1/10^3}$, (b) $\sqrt{1/10^4}$, (c) $\sqrt{1/10^5}$, and (d) $\sqrt{1/10^6}$. An inequality violation ($D < 0$) is observed even for a relatively small experimental scale (i.e., $L = 2, 3, 4$), but the violations would be conspicuous when the experiment scale L becomes large.

In Fig. C.3, we additionally present the values of D along the lines of $L = 2, 3, 4, \mathrm{CI}(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta})$ drawn in Fig. C.2 by increasing L from 2 to n_d (see the main text). Here, we note that our inequality test would be realized in an experiment for the reasonable problem scale $\Theta = \sqrt{10^{-\gamma}}$ and for a value of L that is not too large because the size of the measurement settings becomes larger as L increases. However, in order to see the maximum violation, i.e., $D_{\min}$ (particularly, close to the lower bound -1), it is necessary to increase the measurement settings for a large problem scale N. In Fig. C.4, we plot the data of the maximum violation $D_{\min}$ (blue points) obtained from Monte Carlo simulations compared with the theoretical values (red lines) given by

$$D_{\min} = \mathrm{CI}\left(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta}\right) h\left(\Theta\right) - h\left(\mathrm{CI}\left(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta}\right)\Theta\right). \tag{C.2}$$

The simulations are performed with the setting $L = n_d = \mathrm{CI}(\frac{\pi}{4\Theta})$ to obtain



Figure C.4: (color online) We plot the simulation data (blue points) of the maximum violation, i.e., $D_{\min}$, for $\gamma = 3, 4, 5, 6$. The data are very well matched to the theoretical values (red lines) given by Eq. (C.2).

the maximum violation by increasing γ. However, to reduce the computing flops, the simulations are performed on the two-dimensional space of $|\tau\rangle$ and $|\tau^{\perp}\rangle$ by employing Eq. (B.3). The conditional and marginal probabilities for characterizing the conditional entropies are evaluated by averaging 10^4 outcomes of the measurements at each step. Each point is made by averaging 1000 trials of inequality tests. It is seen that the data are match the theoretical values well. The detailed values are listed in Tab. C.1.

γ	$D_{\min}$ (Simul.)	$D_{\min}$ (Theor.)
3	$\simeq -0.703 \pm 0.013$	$\simeq -0.714$
4	$\simeq -0.878 \pm 0.006$	$\simeq -0.884$
5	$\simeq -0.941 \pm 0.011$	$\simeq -0.955$
6	$\simeq -0.977 \pm 0.004$	$\simeq -0.983$

Table C.1: Values of $D_{\min}$ obtained from the numerical simulations and those using Eq. (C.2) for $\gamma = 3, 4, 5, 6$.

References

References

[1] R. Feynman, Quantum mechanical computers, Foundations of physics (1986) 507.

[2] P. Benioff, Quantum mechanical models of turing machines that dissipate no energy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48 (1982) 1581.

[3] D. Deutsch, Quantum theory the church-turing principle and the universal quantum computer, Proc. R. Soc. London A 400 (1985) 97.

[4] E. Bernstein, U. Vazirani, Quantum complexity theory, in: Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '93, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 1993, pp. 11–20.

[5] D. R. Simon, On the power of quantum computation, SIAM J. Computing 26 (1997) 1474.

[6] D. Deutsch, R. Jozsa, Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation, Proc. R. Soc. London A 439 (1992) 553.

[7] L. K. Grover, Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 325.

[8] P. W. Shor, Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer, SIAM J. comput. 26 (1997) 1484.

[9] C. H. Bennett, E. Bernstein, G. Brassard, U. V. Vazirani, Strengths and weaknesses of quantum computing., SIAM J. Computing 26 (1997) 1510.

[10] L. Adleman, J. DeMarrais, M. Huang, Quantum computability, SIAM Journal on Computing 26 (1997) 1524.

[11] S. Aaronson, Bqp and the polynomial hierarchy, arXiv:0910.4698.

[12] A. Khrennikov, Parallelism of quantum computations from prequantum classical statistical field theory (pcsft), arXiv:0803.1355.

[13] A. Paler, J. Kinseher, I. Polian, J. Hayes, Approximate simulation of circuits with probabilistic behavior, in: Defect and Fault Tolerance in VLSI and Nanotechnology Systems (DFT), 2013 IEEE International Symposium on, 2013, pp. 95–100.

[14] L.-M. Ionescu, A. Mazare, C. Anton, C. Stoian, The hardware implementation of a quantum computation system emulator, in: Applied Electronics (AE), 2014 International Conference on, 2014, pp. 121–124.

[15] C. H. Papadimitriou, Computational complexity, John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 2003.

[16] J. Kofler, Quantum violation of macroscopic realism and the transition to classical physics, arXiv:0812.0238.

[17] J. Kofler, Č. Brukner, Condition for macroscopic realism beyond the leggett-garg inequalities, Phys. Rev. A 87 (2013) 052115.

[18] B. F. Toner, D. Bacon, Communication cost of simulating bell correlations, Physical Review Letters 91 (18) (2003) 187904.

[19] S. Brierley, A. Kosowski, M. Markiewicz, T. Paterek, A. Przysieżna, Nonclassicality of temporal correlations, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115 (2015) 120404.

[20] L. Masanes, A. Acin, N. Gisin, General properties of nonsignaling theories, Phys. Rev. A 73 (2006) 012112.

[21] R. Raussendorf, H. J. Briegel, A one-way quantum computer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (2001) 5188.

[22] M. A. Nielsen, Cluster-state quantum computation, arXiv:0504097.

[23] A. C.-C. Yao, Quantum circuit complexity, in: Proceedings of 34th IEEE POCS, IEEE, 1993, pp. 352–361.

[24] A. Galindo, M. A. Martín-Delgado, Information and computation: Classical and quantum aspects, Rev. Mod. Phys. 74 (2002) 347.

[25] M. Żukowski, Temporal inequalities for sequential multi-time actions in quantum information processing, Frontiers of Physics 9 (2014) 629.

[26] A. Fine, Hidden variables, joint probability, and the bell inequalities, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48 (1982) 291.

[27] G. Brassard, P. Hoyer, M. Mosca, A. Tapp, Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation, arXiv:0005055.

[28] C. Zalka, Grover's quantum searching algorithm is optimal, Phys. Rev. A 60 (1999) 2746.

[29] R. W. Hamming, Coding and Information Theory, Prentice Hall, Englewood, NJ, 1980.

[30] A. Dembo, T. M. Cover, J. A. Thomas, Information theoretic inequalities, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory 37 (1991) 1501.

[31] E. Biham, O. Biham, D. Biron, M. Grassl, D. A. Lidar, D. Shapira, Analysis of generalized grover quantum search algorithms using recursion equations, Phys. Rev. A 63 (2000) 012310.

[32] G. L. Long, Y. S. Li, W. L. Zhang, L. Niu, Phase matching in quantum searching, Phys. Lett. A 262 (1999) 27.